



Certificate of Mailing: Date of Deposit: Ottober 39, 2004

I hereby certify under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to Mail Stop Issue Fee, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA

Printed name of person mailing correspondence

of person mailing correspondence

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

I. Jochmus et al.

Examiner:

A. R. Salimi

Serial No.:

09/980,064

Art Unit:

1648

Filed:

March 27, 2002

Customer No.:

21559

Title:

CYTOTOXIC T-CELL EPITOPES OF THE PAPILLOMAVIRUS

L1-PROTEIN AND USE THEREOF IN DIAGNOSTICS AND

THERAPY

Mail Stop Issue Fee Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPLICATION FOR PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.705

In response to the Determination of Patent Term Adjustment under 35 U.S.C. § 154(b) mailed with the Notice of Allowance on July 30, 2004 in connection with the above-captioned patent application, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the patent term adjustment. Applicants submit that the current patent term adjustment should be 183 days.

The rules governing patent term adjustment due to examination delay are provided for in 37 C.F.R. § 1.702, which states:

[T]he term of an original patent shall be adjusted if issuance of the patent was delayed due to the failure of the Office to:

* * *

(2) Respond to a reply under 35 U.S.C. 132 ... not later than four months after the date on which the reply was filed.

37 C.F.R. § 1.703 states:

(a) The period of adjustment under 1.702(a) is the sum of the following periods:

* * *

(2) The number of days, if any, in the period beginning on the day after the date that is four months after the date a reply under § 1.111 was filed and ending on the mailing date of either an action under 35 U.S.C. 132 or a notice of allowance under 35 U.S.C. 151, whichever occurs first.

On May 9, 2003 Applicants filed a complete reply to the Restriction Requirement mailed on April 23, 2003. The Office mailed a non-final Office Action on March 12, 2004, resulting in a patent term adjustment of 185 days for the Office's delay, past four months, for responding to Applicants' reply.

With regard to reductions in patent term adjustment, 37 C.F.R. § 1.704(b) states:

[T]he period of adjustment set forth in § 1.703 shall be reduced by the number of days, if any, beginning the day after the date that is three months after the mailing or transmission of the Office communication notifying the applicant of the rejection, objection, argument, or other request and ending on the date the reply was filed.

In addition, 37 C.F.R. § 1.703(f) states that the "date indicated on any certificate of mailing or transmission under § 1.8 shall not be taken into account" in calculating the period of patent term adjustment.

During prosecution, Applicants once filed a reply later than three months after the mailing date of an Office communication notifying Applicants of a rejection, objection, argument, or other request. On March 12, 2004, the Office mailed a non-final Office Action. Applicants filed a complete reply to this Action on June 14, 2004, 2 days past three months from the mailing date of the Office Action.

Applicants submit that the 185 days of patent term adjustment due to Office delays should be reduced by 2 days for Applicants' delays, and not by 234 days as shown in the Patent Term Adjustment History on the PAIR system (Exhibit 1). Applicants note that the period of patent term adjustment was reduced by 232 days for Applicants' delay in replying to the Restriction Requirement. This reduction appears to be due to the number of days in excess of three months after the April 23, 2003 mailing date of the Restriction Requirement and when a copy of Applicants' reply was transmitted to the Examiner by facsimile (see Exhibit 1). Applicants note that they mailed a reply to the Restriction Requirement on May 7, 2003 and that this reply was received by the U.S.P.T.O. on May 9, 2003, as indicated by the U.S.P.T.O. stamp on the return postcard included with the reply (Exhibit 2). Thus, the U.S.P.T.O. received Applicants' reply within three months from the mailing date of the Restriction Requirement. Thus, Applicants submit that the

delay of 2 days, which yields a notant term adjustment of 183 days

delay of 2 days, which yields a patent term adjustment of 183 days.

In view of the above facts, this application is currently entitled to 183 days of

patent term adjustment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.703.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the current patent term adjustment should be 183 days and

request reconsideration of the patent term adjustment.

Enclosed is a check in the amount of \$400.00 for the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R.

§ 1.18(f). If there are any additional charges or any credits, please apply them to Deposit

Account No. 03-2095.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 29 October 2004

Karen L. Elbing, Ph

Reg. No. 35,238

Clark & Elbing LLP 101 Federal Street

Boston, MA 02110

Telephone: 617-428-0200

Facsimile: 617-428-7045

4

NOV 0 1 2004

EXHIBIT 1

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Home | Site Index | Search | Guides | Contacts | eBusiness | eBiz alerts | News | Help

PATENT APPLICATION INFORMATION RETRIEVAL



Patent Term Adjustment (PTA) for publication number: 09/980,064				
			Days	
Filing or 371(c) Date:	03-27-2002	USPTO Delay (PTO):	0	
Issue Date of Patent:	•	Three Years:	-	
Pre-Issue Petitions (days):	+0	Applicant Delay (APPL):	234	
Post-Issue Petitions (days):	+0	Total PTA:	0	
USPTO Adjustment (days):	+0	Explanation of Calculations		

Search Options

Assignments
Foreign Priority
Image File Wrapper
File History
Publication Review

Patent Term Adjustment History				
Date	Contents Description	PTO (days)	(days)	
07-30-2004	Mail Notice of Allowance			
07-30-2004	Mail Formal Drawings Required			
07-29-2004	Formal Drawings Required			
07-29-2004	Notice of Allowance Data Verification Completed			
07-29-2004	Case Docketed to Examiner in GAU			
07-29-2004	Notice of Allowability			
07-13-2004	Date Forwarded to Examiner			
06-14-2004	Response after Non-Final Action		2	
06-14-2004	Workflow incoming amendment IFW		1	
03-12-2004	Mail Non-Final Rejection		1	
03-11-2004	Non-Final Rejection			
03-11-2004	IFW Amended case processing Complete			
03-11-2004	Date Forwarded to Examiner			
03-11-2004	Response to Election / Restriction Filed		232	
11-14-2003	Correspondence Address Change		1	
04-23-2003	Mail Restriction Requirement			
04-22-2003	Requirement for Restriction / Election			
05-02-2002	CRF Is Good Technically / Entered into Database			
12-18-2002	Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) Filed			
09-09-2002	Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) Filed			

03-27-2002	Preliminary Amendment	
03-27-2002	Preliminary Amendment	
06-12-2002	Case Docketed to Examiner in GAU	
05-30-2002	IFW Scan & PACR Auto Security Review	
05-21-2002	Application Dispatched from OIPE	
	Notice of DO/EO Acceptance Mailed	
03-27-2002	A statement by one or more inventors satisfying the requirement under 35 USC 115, Oath of the Applic	



EXHIBIT 2

THE SECUTION**	PATEN ATTORI	T NEY DOCKE	T NUMBER:	50125	/037001—	
The U.S. PTO date stamp set	s forth the date of	of receipt of:			VA E	VC.
Applicant/Patentee:	Ingrid	Jochmus	et al.		/ O	ากเรา
Seriol/Patent Number:	09/980,	064			/ PIRT U V	5003 E
Filed/Issued:	Novembe	r 29, 20	001		PATEUR AND	NO EMPE
Title: CYTOTOXI	C T-CELL E	PITOPES	OF THE	PAPILLOMA	VIRUS L1	-PROTEIN.
□ Transmittal Letter □ Notice of Missing Parts □ Reply to Missing Parts □ Reply to Examiner's Action □ Extension of Time □ Notice of Appeal □ Appeal Brief □ Drawings Formal/Informal □ M-Fee Payment □ Issue Fee Payment □ Check □ Other Atty/Secv: KLE: cac Clief	Pages:	□ Assigr □ Chang □ Small □ Prelim □ IDS □ Cited I	- 7	er Sheet nent	Pages: Pages: Pages: Pages: Pages: Number: Pages: P	7/03
	,				_	